

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-16 and 21-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-16, 23 and 25-27 are rejected, and claims 21, 22 and 24 are objected to. By this paper, claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 11, 14-16 and 23 are amended, and claims 5, 21, 22 and 24 are canceled. Based on the following, consideration of the amended claims, and reconsideration of the remaining claims, are requested.

### **Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0019687 (Suzuki et al.). By this paper, claim 23 is amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In particular, the limitations of claim 24 are incorporated into claim 23; accordingly, claim 24 is canceled. The Examiner objected to claim 24, but indicated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Amended claim 23 meets these conditions, and is therefore believed to be allowable. Claim 25, which depends directly from claim 23, is also believed to be allowable.

### **Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11, 14-16, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. By this paper, independent claims 1 and 11 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In addition, claims 3, 5-7 and 14-16 are amended based on the amendments to claims 1 and 11. Amended claim 1 includes the limitations of claim 21 and intervening claim 5, and amended claim 11 includes the limitations of claim 22. Accordingly claims 5, 21 and 22 are canceled.

The Examiner objected to claim 21, but indicated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Amended claim 1 meets these conditions, and is therefore believed to be allowable. The Examiner also objected to claim 22, but indicated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Amended claim 11 meets these conditions, and is therefore also believed to be allowable. Amended claim 1 is the base claim for claims 2-8 and 26, and amended claim 11 is the base claims for claims 14-16 and 27. Therefore, each of these dependent claims is also believed to be allowable.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner objected to claims 21, 22 and 24 as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but indicated that each would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its respective base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed in detail above, the claims have been accordingly rewritten, and the application is now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Ford Global Technologies, LLC Deposit Account No. 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,

**Fangjun Jiang et al.**

By /Marc F. Malooley/  
Marc F. Malooley  
Reg. No. 50,624  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 31 October 2007

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400; Fax: 248-358-3351